UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/204,585	12/03/1998	MARC TREMBLAY	SP-3288-US	5684

24251 7590 05/01/2002

SKJERVEN MORRILL MACPHERSON LLP
25 METRO DRIVE
SUITE 700
SAN JOSE, CA 95110

EXAMINER	
ENG, DAVID Y	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2155	17

DATE MAILED: 05/01/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/204,585	TREMBLAY ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	DAVID Y. ENG	2155	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on *25 February 2002* .

2a)☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b)☒ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are pending in the application.

4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) *1-28* is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) *16* .
4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .
5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
6) ☐ Other: .

The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

Claim 29 has been cancelled. The active claims are 1-28.

Claims 1, 3-14 and 23-28 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yung (5,592,679) in view of Luan (5,911,149).

See Figure 1 and 2 in Yung. Yung discloses a system having a plurality of processors and a global register which is shared by the processors. Each of the processors further includes its own local register which can be accessed by the associated processor only. Yung does not disclose whether the global register and the local register sets are programmably configurable. However, Luan taught a computer system (see at least abstract, Brief Summary and Figure 2) having a programmably configurable memory for programmably configuring the memory into sets of local and shared (global) memory. Local memory is for the processor only and shared memory sets are for sharing amonr other functional units in the computer system. Since both references are directed toward a computer system having local and shared memories, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to incorporate a programmably configurable memory as taught by Luan in Yung such that memory allocation can be programmably changed.

As with other dependent claims, given the configuration of the processing system and the register file, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use an address space dependent on the configuration for addressing the partitioned register file such that the

local register sets and the global regsiter sets can be accessed by the functional units because otherwise it would not work.

Claims 2 and 15-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Yung (5,592,679) and Luan (5,911,149) further in view of Nashimoto (6,023,757).

Yung and luan disclose claim combination set forth above. Although Yung's processor is of multiple functional units type, it is not clear whether his instrucitons are VLIW. VLIW instruction is well known in the art. Nishimoto shows in Figure 1 a processing system having a local register (line 64, col 5), in Figure 2 a processing system having a global register (line 35, col 7). Both systems use VLIW instructions. From the teaching of Nishimoto, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art to use VLIW instructions such that more control signals can be generated.

In the communication filed on February 25, 2002, Applicants identify a respective excerpt from the Yung reference and the claim and conclude that the reference does not meet the claim limitation. Applicants fails to provide arguments as to why the invention as formulated by the Examiner based on the applied references is in error. It appears the Applicants are looking for the identical claim languages in the references. There is no arguments presented as to why the references can not be combined together as suggested by the Examiner.

With respect to Yung teaches away from the invention, Applicants did not claim a single centralized register file. Rather, the claims are directed to plurality of global and local registers. Further, the Examiner relies on the other reference for the teaching of configurability.

The remarks directed to "programmably configurable" are well taken. The Luan reference is cited for that limitation.

As to the dependent claims, Applicants request the Examiner to cite a reference to support the Examiner,s opinion. The evidence is on the claims. The claims recite various configurations and variou address schemes. Further, Applicants fail to present arguments as to why the invention as recited in the claims is patenatble over the prior art. In re Nielson, 816 F.2d 1567, 2 USPQ 1525 (Fed. Cir. 1987). The court held that simply pointing out what a claim requires with no attempt to point out how the claims patentably distinguish over the prior art does not amount to a separate argument for patentability.

As to the Nishimoto, the reference is cited for the teaching of VLIW. The Examiner relies on the other applied references for the other limitations in the claims.

DAVID Y. ENG
PRIMARY EXAMINER